



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,585	09/18/2000	Volker Stahl	PHD 99-124	4107

24737 7590 07/13/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

STORM, DONALD L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/663,585

**Applicant(s)**

STAHL ET AL.

**Examiner**

Donald L. Storm

**Art Unit**

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

##### **Attwater and Cecinati**

2. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Attwater et al. [US Patent 5,940,793] in view of Cecinati et al. [US Patent 4,907,278] using the same rationale as in the prior Office action (mailed January 19, 2005).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 1-5 are allowed.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. The prior Office action, mailed January 19, 2005, objects to the claims and rejects claims under 35 USC § 103. The Applicant's arguments and changes in AMENDMENT, filed April 21, 2005, have been fully considered with the following results.

5. With respect to objection to those claims needing clarification, the changes entered by amendment provide clear descriptions of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the objections are removed.

6. With respect to rejection of claims under 35 USC § 103, citing the combination of Junqua and Fujisaki only and with others, the Applicant's arguments appear to be as follows:

a. The Applicant's argument appears to be that the dissimilarities in explicit teachings and problems to be solved by the letter models of Junqua and of Fujisaki would make is unlikely that an artisan would have consulted Fujisaki and applied teachings of the language model to Junqua's bigram model. This argument is persuasive. It would not have been obvious because it is reasonable that an artisan familiar with approaches to speech recognition and to handwriting recognition would not have seen Fujisaki's similarities to Junqua's problem when looking for details of how to implement Junqua's bigram letter model because Fujisaki does not use a bigram model. Fujisaki's [at column 16, lines 37-68] is a word model of letters for recognition.

b. The Applicant's argument appears to be that Junqua could no longer be used as intended without using a N-gram letter grammar that denotes letter combinations. This argument is persuasive. Although, Junqua's [at column 8, lines 1-65] use of a bi-gram grammar is merely a preferred algorithm, when considering other grammars, Junqua does not consider a grammar with probabilities of single letters, without letter combinations.

The Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and they are persuasive. Accordingly, the rejections are removed.

7. With respect to rejection of claims under 35 USC § 103, citing the combination of Attwater and Cecinati, the Applicant's arguments appear to be as follows:

a. The Applicant's argument appears to be that Attwater does not cull a smaller vocabulary to use for recognizing the town name from recognition results of letter recognition. Accordingly, a combination of Attwater and Cecinati does not include or make obvious all subject

matter of the claim. This argument is not persuasive because Attwater [at column 8, lines 10-25] teaches that the prior recognition that leads to a smaller vocabulary for later use could be recognition results of recognizing letters that spell the town name as indicated in the prior Office action. Recognition results of those letters become the list of words that the word recognition of the town name will use.

The Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Accordingly, the rejection is maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

#### **Mail Stop AF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**or faxed to:**

(703) 872-9306, (please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE"; for formal communications and for informal or draft communications, additionally marked "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

**On and After July 15, 2005, fax to:**

(571) 273-8300.

Patent Correspondence delivered by hand or delivery services, other than the USPS, should be addressed as follows and brought to U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Customer Service Window, **Mail Stop AF**, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L. Storm, of Art Unit 2654, whose telephone number is (571) 272-7614. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays between 8:00 AM and 4:30 PM Eastern Time. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: [ebc@uspto.gov](mailto:ebc@uspto.gov). For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

*Donald L. Storm*  
Donald L. Storm  
July 5, 2005

  
RICHEMOND DORVIL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER